

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please substitute the attached 7 sheets (FIGURES 1-7h) of formal drawings for the informal drawings originally filed with the application. A separate Transmittal of Formal Drawings is submitted.

REMARKS

This Reply and Amendment is intended to be completely responsive to the non-final Office Action dated August 23, 2005. Claims 1-27 and 37-47 are pending in this Application. Original Claims 1-41 stand rejected. Claims 28-36 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 19-27, 37, 39, and 41 have been amended. New Claims 42-47 have been added to provide claims of varying scope.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

On page 2 of the Detailed Action, Claims 1-6, 10-21, 23-27 and 37-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,977,585 issued to Boyd.

Claims 1-6 and 10-18

Claim 1 is in independent form. Independent Claim 1 (as amended) now recites a “system for the attenuation of radiation” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “shield made of a radiation attenuation material [that is] configured to be selectively added to and removed from the Computed Tomography machine depending on the Computed Tomography procedure.”

A “system for the attenuation of radiation” in which a “shield is configured to be selectively added to and removed from the Computed Tomography machine depending on the Computed Tomography procedure” as required by independent Claim 1 (as amended) is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Boyd.

In direct contrast, Boyd discloses “self-shielded computerized tomographic scanner” having “front and rear movable shield curtains 21 and 25” that are coupled to the scanner using “guides and drive means” in the form of “brackets” and “lead screws” respectively. (Col. 3, lines 21-23). Such a configuration (while arguably detachable from the scanner as stated by the Examiner) is not “configured to be selectively added to and removed from the

Computed Tomography machine depending on the Computed Tomography procedure” as required by independent Claim 1 (as amended).

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent Claim 1 (as amended) and dependent Claims 2-6 and 10-18 as they depend from independent Claim 1.

The Applicants also note that other claims are allowable for additional reasons. For example, Claim 3 recites that “the shield is a one-piece member,” Claim 4 recites that “the shield is configured to be directly coupled to a front portion of the Computed Tomography machine,” Claim 5 recites that “the shield is configured to remain stationary as a patient enters the opening defined by the gantry,” Claim 6 recites that “the shield is configured to be engaged by the patient entering the opening,” and Claim 13 recites that “the radiation attenuation material is substantially non-lead.” A system of the attenuation of radiation having one or more of these features is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Boyd.

Claims 19-21 and 23-27

Claim 19 is in independent form. Independent Claim 19 (as amended) now recites a “system for the attenuation of radiation” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “shield made of a radiation attenuation material [that is] configured to be selectively added to and removed from the Computed Tomography machine depending on the Computed Tomography procedure.”

As stated above, a “system for the attenuation of radiation” in which a “shield is configured to be selectively added to and removed from the Computed Tomography machine depending on the Computed Tomography procedure” as required by independent Claim 19 (as amended) is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Boyd.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent Claim 19 (as amended) and dependent Claims 20-21 and 23-27 as they depend from independent Claim 19.

Claims 37-40

Claim 37 is in independent form. Independent Claim 37 (as amended) now recites a “method of attenuating radiation” comprising, in combination with other steps, “detachably coupling a radiation attenuation material to the Computed Tomography machine . . . wherein the radiation attenuation material is configured to be selectively added to and removed from the Computed Tomography machine.”

For the above-mentioned reasons, a “method of attenuating radiation” in which a “radiation attenuation material is configured to be selectively added to and removed from the Computed Tomography machine” as required by independent Claim 37 (as amended) is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Boyd.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent Claim 37 (as amended) and dependent Claims 38-40 as they depend from independent Claim 37.

Claim 41

Claim 40 is in independent form. Independent Claim 41 (as amended) now recites a “system for the attenuation of radiation” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “means for reducing radiation exposure . . . configured to be coupled to [a] Computed Tomography machine . . . [and formed of a material that] is substantially non-lead.”

A “system for the attenuation of radiation ” in which a “a means for reducing radiation exposure. . . [that] is substantially non-lead” as required by independent Claim 41 (as amended) is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Boyd.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent Claim 41 (as amended).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On pages 5-9 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyd in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,794,128 issued to Shasky, Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyd in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,638 issued to Jaeger, Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyd in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,006,718 issued to Lenhart, and Claims 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orrison in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,038,047 issued to Still.

Dependent Claims 7-9 depend from independent Claim 1 (as amended). Dependent Claim 22 depends from independent Claim 19. Dependent Claims 31-36 have been canceled without prejudice. As previously described, the Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 19 to recite a combination of subject matter the Applicants believe to be allowable.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome and dependent Claims 7-9 as they depend from independent Claim 1 (as amended) and dependent Claim 22 as it depends from independent Claim 19 (as amended), are now allowable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent Claims 7-9 and 22.

New Claims

The Applicants have added new dependent Claims 42-47 to provide claims of varying scope. New dependent Claims 42-47 depend from independent Claim 41 (as amended). The Applicants believe new dependent Claims 42-47 are allowable for reason of their dependency alone. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of new Claims 42-47.

* * *

Independent Claims 1, 19, 37, and 41 and dependent Claims 2-7, 9-13, 20-27, and 39 have been amended. New claims 42-47 have been added. The Applicants submit that the Application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of Claims 1-27 and 37-47.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11/23/05

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5652
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

By 
Adam M. Gustafson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 54,601